arXiv:1408.5732v1 [math.DS] 25 Aug 2014

CONJUGACIES BETWEEN P- HOMEOMORPHISMS WITH SEVERAL BREAKS[1]

Akhtam Dzhalilov[2], Dieter Mayer[3],
Utkir Safarov[4]

Abstract

Let $f_i, i = 1, 2$ be orientation preserving circle homeomorphisms with a finite number of break points, at which the first derivatives Df_i have jumps, and with identical irrational rotation number $\rho = \rho_{f_1} = \rho_{f_2}$. The jump ratio of f_i at the break point b is denoted by $\sigma_{f_i}(b)$, i.e. $\sigma_{f_i}(b) := \frac{Df_i(b-0)}{Df_i(b+0)}$. Denote by $\sigma_{f_i}, i = 1, 2$, the total jump ratio given by the product over all break points b of the jump ratios $\sigma_{f_i}(b)$ of f_i. We prove, that for circle homeomorphisms $f_i, i = 1, 2$, which are $C^{2+\varepsilon}, \varepsilon > 0$, on each interval of continuity of Df_i and whose total jump ratios σ_{f_1} and σ_{f_2} do not coincide, the congugacy between f_1 and f_2 is a singular function.

1 Introduction

Let f be an orientation preserving homeomorphism of the circle $S^1 \equiv \mathbb{R}^1/\mathbb{Z}^1$ with lift $F : \mathbb{R}^1 \to \mathbb{R}^1$, which is continuous, strictly increasing and fulfills $F(x + 1) = F(x) + 1$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$. The circle homeomorphism f is then defined by $f(x) = F(x) \ (mod\, 1)$, $x \in S^1$.

Denjoy's classical theorem [5] states, that a circle diffeomorphism f with irrational rotation number $\rho = \rho_f$ and such that $\log Df$ is of bounded variation, is conjugate to the linear rotation f_ρ, that is, there exists a homeomorphism φ of the circle with $f = \varphi^{-1} \circ f_\rho \circ \varphi$.

It is well known that a circle homeomorphisms f with irrational rotation number ρ is strictly ergodic, i.e. it has a unique f- invariant probability measure μ_f. A remarkable fact is then that the conjugacy φ can be defined by $\varphi(x) = \mu_f([0, x])$ (see [3]), which shows, that the regularity properties of this conjugacy φ imply the corresponding properties of the density of the absolutely continuous invariant measure μ_f. The problem of smoothness of the conjugacy of smooth diffeomorphisms is by now very well understood (see for instance [1],[17],[11],[12],[14],[18]). Notice, that for a sufficiently smooth circle diffeomorphism with a typical irrational rotation number its invariant measure is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesque measure (see [12],[14]).

A natural extension of circle diffeomorphisms are piecewise smooth homeomorphisms with break points or shortly, the class of P-homeomorphisms.

This class of **P-homeomorphisms** consists of orientation preserving circle homeomorphisms f which are differentiable except at a finite number of break points, at which the one-sided positive derivatives Df_- and Df_+ exist, which do not coincide and for which there exist constants $0 < c_1 < c_2 < \infty$, such that

[1] MSC: 37E10, 37C15, 37C40

Keywords and phrases: circle homeomorphism, break point, rotation number, conjugation

[2]Turin Politechnic University in Tashkent, Kichik halqa yuli, 17, 100095, Tashkent, Uzbekistan. *E-mail*: a_dzhalilov@yahoo.com

[3]Institut für Theoretische Physik, TU Clausthal, D-38678 Clausthal-Zellerfeld, Germany. *E-mail*: dieter.mayer@tu-clausthal.de

[4] Institute of Mathematics, National University of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan. *E-mail*: safarovua@mail.ru

• $c_1 < Df_-(x_b) < c_2$ and $c_1 < Df_+(x_b) < c_2$ for all $x_b \in B(f)$, the set of break points of f in S^1;

• $c_1 < Df(x) < c_2$ for all $x \in S^1 \backslash B(f)$;

• $\log Df$ has bounded variation in S^1 i.e. $v := var_{S^1} \log Df < \infty$.

The ratio $\sigma_f(x_b) = \frac{Df_-(x_b)}{Df_+(x_b)}$ is called the **jump ratio** of f at x_b or, for short, the f-**jump**. The product of all jump ratios is called the **total jump** of f and denoted by σ_f. Notice, that Denjoy's result can be extended to P-homeomorphisms with irrational rotation numbers, its precise formulation will be given later.

The regularity properties of the invariant measures of P-homeomorphisms are quite different from those of diffeomorphisms (see [6],[16], [7], [8], [9]). Dzhalilov, Mayer and Safarov proved in [9], that the invariant measures of piecewise $C^{2+\varepsilon}$ P-homeomorphisms f with non trivial total jump σ_f and with irrational rotation number are singular w.r.t. Lebesgue measure. In this case the conjugacy φ between f and the linear rotation f_ρ is a singular function. Here then arises naturally the problem of regularity of the conjugacy between two circle maps with identical irrational rotation numbers and with break points. This is the so called rigidity problem for circle homeomorphisms with break points. The case of two circle maps with one break point and the same jump ratio were studied in detail by K. Khanin and D. Khmelev [13], K. Khanin and A. Teplinsky [15]. To formulate their result, let $\rho = 1/(k_1 + 1/(k_2 + ... + 1/(k_n + ...))) := [k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n, \dots]$ be the continued fraction expansion of the irrational rotation number ρ.

Define

$$M_o = \{\rho : \exists C > 0, \forall n \in \mathbb{N},\, k_{2n-1} \le C\}, \quad M_e = \{\rho : \exists C > 0, \forall n \in \mathbb{N},\, k_{2n} \le C\}.$$

Then K. Khanin and A. Teplinskii proved in [15]

Theorem 1.1. *Let $f_i \in C^{2+\alpha}(S^1 \backslash \{b_i\})$, $i = 1, 2$, $\alpha > 0$, be circle homeomorphisms with one break point, the same jump ratio σ and the same irrational rotation number $\rho \in (0, 1)$. If either $\sigma > 1$ and $\rho \in M_e$ or $\sigma < 1$ and $\rho \in M_o$, then the map h conjugating the homeomorphisms f_1 and f_2 is a C^1-diffeomorphism.*

In the case of homeomorphisms with different jump ratios the following theorem was proved by A. Dzhalilov, H. Akin and S. Temir in [10]:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $f_i \in C^{2+\alpha}(S^1 \backslash \{b_i\})$, $i = 1, 2$, $\alpha > 0$, be circle homeomorphisms with one break point and different jump ratio but the same irrational rotation number $\rho \in (0, 1)$. Then the map h conjugating the homeomorphisms f_1 and f_2 is a singular function.*

Now consider two piecewise-smooth circle homeomorphisms f_1 and f_2 with m ($m \ge 2$) break points and the same irrational rotation number. Denote by $B(f_1)$ and $B(f_2)$ the set of break points of f_1 and f_2 respectively.

Definition 1.3. *The homeomorphisms f_1, f_2 are said to be **break point equivalent** if there exists a topological conjugacy ψ_0 such that*

(1) $\psi_0(B(f_1)) = B(f_2)$;

(2) $\sigma_{f_2}(\psi_0(b)) = \sigma_{f_1}(b)$, for all $b \in B(f_1)$.

The rigidity problem for break point equivalent $C^{2+\alpha}$-homeomorphisms f with trivial total jumps $\sigma_f = 1$ was studied by K. Cunha and D. Smania in [4]. It was proven

there that any two such homeomorphisms fulfilling certain combinatorial conditions are C^1-conjugated. The main idea of their proof is to consider piecewise-smooth circle homeomorphisms as generalized interval exchange transformations. The case of non break point equivalent homeomorphisms with two break points was studied by H. Akhadkulov, A. Dzhalilov and D. Mayer in [2]. Their main result is the following theorem:

Theorem 1.4. *Let $f_i \in C^{2+\alpha}(S^1\backslash\{a_i, b_i\}), i = 1, 2$ be circle homeomorphisms with two break points a_i, b_i. Assume that*

(1) their rotation numbers ρ_{f_i}, $i = 1, 2$ are irrational and coincide i.e. $\rho_{f_1} = \rho_{f_2} = \rho$;

(2) there exists a bijection ψ such that $\psi(B(f_1)) = B(f_2)$;

(3) $\sigma_{f_1} = \sigma_{f_1}(a_1)\sigma_{f_1}(b_1) \neq \sigma_{f_2} = \sigma_{f_2}(a_2)\sigma_{f_2}(b_2)$.

Then the map h conjugating f_1 and f_2 is a singular function.

In the present paper we study the conjugacy h of two piecewise smooth circle homeomorphisms f_1 and f_2 with an arbitrary finite number of break points .

Our main result is the following theorem:

Theorem 1.5. *Let f_i, $i = 1, 2$, be P-homeomorphisms with the same irrational rotation number $\rho = \rho_{f_1} = \rho_{f_2}$. Assume, that*

(1) f_i, $i = 1, 2$ is $C^{2+\alpha}$, $\alpha > 0$, on each interval of continuity of Df_i;

(2) the total jumps of f_1 and f_2 do not coincide i.e.

$$\sigma_{f_1} = \prod_{b\in B(f_1)} \sigma_{f_1}(b) \neq \sigma_{f_2} = \prod_{b\in B(f_2)} \sigma_{f_2}(b).$$

Then the map h conjugating f_1 and f_2 is a singular function.

2 Preliminaries and Notations

Let f be an orientation-preserving circle homeomorphism with lift F. The important characteristic of homeomorphism f is the rotation number defined by

$$\rho_f := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{F^n(x)}{n} \ (mod 1).$$

Here and below, F^n denotes the n-th iteration of F. Suppose the rotation number ρ_f is irrational.Then it can be uniquely represented as a continued fraction i.e. $\rho_f := [k_1, k_2, ..., k_n, ...]$. Define $\frac{p_n}{q_n} := [k_1, k_2, ..., k_n], n \geq 1$ the convergent of ρ_f. Their denominators q_n satisfy the recurrence relation: $q_{n+1} = k_{n+1}q_n + q_{n-1}, n \geq 1$, with the initial conditions $q_0 = 1$ and $q_1 = k_1$.

Fix a point $x_0 \in S^1$. Its positive orbit $\{x_i = f^i(x_0),\ i = 0, 1, 2...\}$ defines a sequence of natural partitions of the circle: denote by $\Delta_0^{(n)}(x_0)$ the closed interval in S^1 with endpoints x_0 and $x_{q_n} = f^{q_n}(x_0)$. Notice, that for n odd the point x_{q_n} is to the left of x_0, and for n even it is to its right. Denote by $\Delta_i^{(n)}(x_0) = f^i(\Delta_0^{(n)}(x_0)), i \geq 1$, the iterates of the interval $\Delta_0^{(n)}(x_0)$ under f. It is well known, that the set $\eta_n(x_0)$ of intervals with mutually disjoint interiors defined as

$$\eta_n(x_0) = \{\Delta_i^{(n-1)}(x_0),\ 0 \leq i \leq q_n - 1\} \cup \{\Delta_j^{(n)}(x_0),\ 0 \leq j \leq q_{n-1} - 1\}$$

determines a partition of the circle for any n. The partition $\eta_n(x_0)$ is called the n-th **dynamical partition** of the point x_0. Proceeding from $\eta_n(x_0)$ to $\eta_{n+1}(x_0)$ all the intervals $\Delta_j^{(n)}(x_0),\ 0 \le j \le q_{n-1}-1$, are preserved, whereas each of the intervals $\Delta_i^{(n-1)}(x_0)$ is partitioned into k_n+1 subintervals belonging to $\eta_{n+1}(x_0)$ such that

$$\Delta_i^{(n-1)}(x_0) = \Delta_i^{(n+1)}(x_0) \cup \bigcup_{s=0}^{k_{n+1}-1} \Delta_{i+q_{n-1}+sq_n}^{(n)}(x_0).$$

Obviously one has $\eta_1(x_0) \le \eta_2(x_0) \le ... \le \eta_n(x_0) \le ....$

Definition 2.1. *Let $K > 1$ be a constant. We call two intervals I_1 and I_2 of S^1 K-comparable, if the inequality $K^{-1}\ell(I_2) \le \ell(I_1) \le K\ell(I_2)$ holds.*

Following [12] we recall definition.

Definition 2.2. *An interval $I = [\tau, t] \subset S^1$ is said to be q_n-small, and its endpoints q_n-close, if the intervals $f^i(I),\ 0 \le i \le q_n - 1$, are pairwise disjoint (except for endpoints).*

It follows from the structure of the dynamical partitions that an interval $I = [\tau, t]$ is q_n-small if and only if either $\tau \prec t \preceq f^{q_{n-1}}(\tau)$, or $f^{q_{n-1}}(t) \preceq \tau \prec t$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let f be a class P-homeomorphism with a finite number of break points and irrational rotation number $\rho = \rho_f$. If the interval $I = (x, y) \subset S^1$ is q_n- small and $f^s(x),\ f^s(y) \notin B(f)$ for all $0 \le s < q_n$, then for any $k \in [0, q_n]$ the following inequality holds:*

$$e^{-v} \le \frac{Df^k(x)}{Df^k(y)} \le e^v, \tag{2.1}$$

where v is total variation of $\log Df$ in S^1.

Proof of Lemma 2.3. Take any two q_n-close points $x, y \in S^1$ and $0 \le k \le q_n - 1$. Denote by I the open interval with endpoints x and y. Because the intervals $f^i(I),\ 0 \le i \le q_n - 1$ are disjoint, we obtain

$$|\ln Df^k(x) - \ln Df^k(y)| \le \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} |\ln Df(f^j(x)) - \ln Df(f^j(y))| \le v,$$

from which inequality (2.1) follows immediately.

Using Lemma 2.3 the following lemma can be proven which plays a key role in the study of the metrical properties of homeomorphisms.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose the circle homeomorphism f satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.3. Then for any y_0 with $y_s := f^s(y_0) \notin B(f)$, for all $s \in [0, q_n)$ the following inequality holds:*

$$e^{-v} \le \prod_{s=0}^{q_n-1} Df(y_s) \le e^v. \tag{2.2}$$

Inequality (2.2) is called the Denjoy's inequality. It follows from Lemma 2.4 that the intervals of the dynamical partition $\eta_n(x_0)$ have exponentially small lengths. Indeed one finds

Corollary 2.5. *Let $\Delta^{(n)}$ be an arbitrary element of the dynamical partition $\eta_n(x_0)$. Then*

$$\ell(\Delta^{(n)}) \leq const\lambda^n \tag{2.3}$$

where $\lambda = (1+e^{-v})^{-\frac{1}{2}} < 1$.

Definition 2.6. *Two homeomorphisms f_1 and f_2 of the circle are said to be topologically equivalent if there exists a homeomorphism $\varphi : S^1 \to S^1$ such that $\varphi(f_1(x)) = f_2(\varphi(x))$ for any $x \in S^1$.*

The homeomorphism φ is called a **conjugacy**. Corollary 2.5 implies the following generalization of the classical Denjoy theorem:

Theorem 2.7. *Suppose that a homeomorphism f satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.3. Then the homeomorphism f is topologically conjugate to the linear rotation f_ρ.*

In the proof of our main theorem the tool of **cross- ratio** plays a key role.

Definition 2.8. *The* **cross-ratio** *of four numbers (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4), $z_1 < z_2 < z_3 < z_4$, is the number*

$$Cr(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) = \frac{(z_2 - z_1)(z_4 - z_3)}{(z_3 - z_1)(z_4 - z_2)}.$$

Definition 2.9. *Given four real numbers (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) with $z_1 < z_2 < z_3 < z_4$ and a strictly increasing function $F : \mathbb{R}^1 \to \mathbb{R}^1$. The distortion of their cross-ratio under F is given by*

$$Dist(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4; F) = \frac{Cr(F(z_1), F(z_2), F(z_3), F(z_4))}{Cr(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4)}.$$

For $m \geq 3$ and $z_i \in S^1$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, suppose that $z_1 \prec z_2 \prec ... \prec z_m \prec z_1$ (in the sense of the ordering on the circle). Then we set $\hat{z}_1 := z_1$ and

$$\hat{z}_i := \begin{cases} z_i, & \text{if } z_1 \prec z_i \prec 1, \\ 1 + z_i, & \text{if } 0 \prec z_i \prec z_1. \end{cases}$$

for $2 \leq i \leq m$.

Obviously, $\hat{z}_1 < \hat{z}_2 < ... < \hat{z}_m$. The vector $(\hat{z}_1, \hat{z}_2, ..., \hat{z}_m)$ is called the lifted vector of $(z_1, z_2, ..., z_m) \in (S^1)^m$.

Let f be a circle homeomorphism with lift F. We define the cross-ratio distortion of (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4), $z_1 \prec z_2 \prec z_3 \prec z_4 \prec z_1$ with respect to f by $Dist(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4; f) = Dist(\hat{z}_1, \hat{z}_2, \hat{z}_3, \hat{z}_4; F)$, where $(\hat{z}_1, \hat{z}_2, \hat{z}_3, \hat{z}_4)$ is the lifted vector of (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4). We need the following

Lemma 2.10. *(see [6]). Let $z_i \in S^1$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, $z_1 \prec z_2 \prec z_3 \prec z_4$. Consider a circle homeomorphism f with $f \in C^{2+\varepsilon}([z_1, z_4])$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and $Df(x) \geq const > 0$ for $x \in [z_1, z_4]$. Then there is a positive constant $C_1 = C_1(f)$ such that*

$$\mid Dist(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4; f) - 1 \mid \leq C_1 |\hat{z}_4 - \hat{z}_1|^{1+\varepsilon},$$

where $(\hat{z}_1, \hat{z}_2, \hat{z}_3, \hat{z}_4)$ is the lifted vector of (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4).

We next consider the case where the interval $[z_1, z_4]$ contains a break point b of the homeomorphism f. More precisely, suppose $b \in [z_1, z_2]$. Let $\sigma_f(b)$ be the jump of f at b. We define numbers α, β, τ, ξ and z as follows:

$$\alpha := \hat{z}_2 - \hat{z}_1,\ \beta := \hat{z}_3 - \hat{z}_2,\ \tau := \hat{z}_2 - \hat{b},\ \xi := \frac{\beta}{\alpha},\ z := \frac{\tau}{\alpha}.$$

where $(\hat{z}_1, \hat{b}, \hat{z}_2, \hat{z}_3)$ is the lifted vector of (z_1, b, z_2, z_3).

In what follows we shall need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.11. *(see [6]). For the circle homeomorphism f with $f \in C^2([z_1, z_4]\backslash\{b\})$, and $Df(x) \geq const > 0$ for $x \in [z_1, z_4]\backslash\{b\}$ one has*

$$\left| Dist(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4; f) - \frac{[\sigma_f(b) + (1 - \sigma_f(b))z](1 + \xi)}{\sigma_f(b) + (1 - \sigma_f(b))z + \xi} \right| \leq C_2 |\hat{z}_4 - \hat{z}_1|,$$

where the constant $C_2 > 0$ depends only on f.

3 On q_n-preimages of break points

Let f_1 and f_2 be P-homeomorphisms with identical irrational rotation numbers $\rho = \rho_{f_1} = \rho_{f_2}$. Denote by $B(f_1) = \{b_1^{(i)}, 1 \leq i \leq m_1\}$ and $B(f_2) = \{b_2^{(j)}, 1 \leq j \leq m_2\}$ the sets of all break points of f_1 and f_2, respectively. Take two copies of the circle on which the homeomorphisms f_1 and f_2 act respectively. Denote by φ_i, $i = 1, 2$ the conjugacies between f_i and f_ρ i. e. $\varphi_1 \circ f_1 = f_\rho \circ \varphi_1$ and $\varphi_2 \circ f_2 = f_\rho \circ \varphi_2$. It is easy to check that the homeomorphisms f_1 and f_2 are then conjugated by $h = \varphi_2 \circ \varphi_1^{-1}$ i. e. $h \circ f_1(x) = f_2 \circ h(x), \forall x \in S^1$. For $x_0 \in S^1$ let $\eta_n(x_0)$ be its n-th dynamical partition. Put $t_0 := h(x_0)$ and consider the dynamical partition $\tau_n(t_0)$ of t_0 on the second circle determined by the homeomorphism f_2 i.e.

$$\tau_n(t_0) = \{C_i^{(n-1)}(t_0),\ 0 \leq i \leq q_n - 1\} \cup \{C_j^{(n)}(t_0),\ 0 \leq j \leq q_{n-1} - 1\}.$$

with $C_0^{(n)}(t_0)$ the closed interval with endpoints t_0 and $f_2^{q_n}(t_0)$. Chose an odd natural number $n = n(f_1, f_2)$ such that the n-th renormalization neighborhoods $[x_{q_n}, x_{q_{n-1}}]$ and $[t_{q_n}, t_{q_{n-1}}]$ do not contain any break point of f_1 and f_2 respectively. Since the identical rotation number ρ of f_1 and f_2 is irrational, the order of the points on the orbit $\{f_1^k(x_0),\ k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ on the first circle will be precisely the same as the one for the orbit $\{f_2^k(t_0),\ k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ on the second one. This together with the relation $h(f_1(x)) = f_2(h(x))$ for $x \in S^1$ implies that

$$h(\Delta_i^{(n-1)}) = C_i^{(n-1)},\ 0 \leq i \leq q_n - 1,\ h(\Delta_i^{(n)}) = C_j^{(n)},\ 0 \leq j \leq q_{n-1} - 1. \tag{3.1}$$

The structure of the dynamical partitions implies that $\overline{b}_1^{(i)}(n) = f_1^{-l_1^{(i)}}(b_1^{(i)}) \in [x_{q_n}, x_{q_{n-1}}],\ 1 \leq i \leq m_1$, where $l_1^{(i)} \in (0, q_{n-1})$ if $\overline{b}_1^{(i)}(n) \in [x_{q_n}, x_0]$, and $l_1^{(i)} \in (0, q_n)$ if $\overline{b}_1^{(i)}(n) \in [x_0, x_{q_{n-1}}]$. Also $\overline{b}_2^{(j)}(n) = f_2^{-l_2^{(j)}}(b_2^{(j)}) \in [t_{q_n}, t_{q_{n-1}}],\ 1 \leq j \leq m_2$ where $l_2^{(j)} \in (0, q_{n-1})$ if $\overline{b}_2^{(j)}(n) \in [t_{q_n}, t_0]$, and $l_2^{(j)} \in (0, q_n)$ if $\overline{b}_2^{(j)}(n) \in [t_0, t_{q_{n-1}}]$. The points $\overline{b}_1^{(i)}(n)$ and $\overline{b}_2^{(j)}(n)$ are called the q_n-**preimages** of the break points $b_1^{(i)}$ and $b_2^{(j)}$. Denote by $\overline{B}^{(n)}(f_i), i = 1, 2$, the sets of q_n-preimages in the renormalization intervals $[x_{q_n}, x_{q_{n-1}}]$ and $[t_{q_n}, t_{q_{n-1}}]$ of the

sets $B(f_1)$ and $B(f_2)$, respectively. Then the number of points in $\overline{B}^{(n)}(f_i), i = 1, 2$, is not greater than m_i. Next, consider the set $h^{-1}(\overline{B}^{(n)}(f_2))$. Using the relations (3.1) we find that $h^{-1}(\overline{B}^{(n)}(f_2)) \subset [x_{q_n}, x_{q_{n-1}}]$. Notice, that the number of elements of the set $\overline{B}^{(n)}(f_1) \cup h^{-1}(\overline{B}^{(n)}(f_2))$ is bounded by $m_1 + m_2$.

We set

$$B^{(n)}_{m_1,m_2} = \{x_{q_n},\, x_0,\, x_{q_{n-1}}\} \cup \overline{B}^{(n)}(f_1) \cup h^{-1}(\overline{B}^{(n)}(f_2)),\ d_n = \ell([x_{q_n}, x_{q_{n-1}}]). \tag{3.2}$$

Let $m_0 \in N$, $m_0 > m_1 + m_2 + 3$. For every $l \geq 0$ we define a partition $D^{(n)}_l$ of the interval $[x_{q_n}, x_{q_{n-1}}]$ using the points $t_s = x_{q_n} + m_0^{-(l+1)} d_n s$, $s = 0, 1, ..., m_0^{l+1}$. Obviously, the length of every such interval $I^{(n)}_l$ of $D^{(n)}_l$ is equal to $m_0^{-(l+1)} d_n$. When passing from $D^{(n)}_l$ to $D^{(n)}_{l+1}$, every interval of $D^{(n)}_l$ is divided into m_0 intervals $D^{(n)}_{l+1}$.

Definition 3.1. *An interval of $D^{(n)}_l$ that does not contain any elements of $B^{(n)}_{m_1,m_2}$ is called an $l^{(n)}$-empty interval. Otherwise it is called an $l^{(n)}$-occupied interval.*

Since the number of intervals of $D^{(n)}_0$ is greater than the number of elements of $B^{(n)}_{m_1,m_2}$, there exists at least one $0^{(n)}$-empty interval. Furthermore, every $l^{(n)}$-occupied interval of $D^{(n)}_l$ contains at least one $(l+1)^{(n)}$-empty interval of $D^{(n)}_{l+1}$. Note that the leftmost and rightmost intervals of $D^{(n)}_l$ contain x_{q_n} and $x_{q_{n+1}}$, respectively. This means that these extreme intervals are $l^{(n)}$-occupied for any $l \geq 0$. Removing all $l^{(n)}$-empty intervals from the interval $[x_{q_n}, x_{q_{n+1}}]$, we obtain a natural partition of $B^{(n)}_{m_1,m_2}$ into non-empty disjoint parts. Denote this partition by $\Gamma^{(n)}_l$. Between two elements of the partition $\Gamma^{(n)}_l$ lies at least one $l^{(n)}$-empty interval. Removing all $l^{(n)}$-occupied intervals from the interval $[x_{q_n}, x_{q_{n+1}}]$ we obtain the set $V^{(n)}_l$ of intervals.

The structure of the set $\overline{B}^{(n)}(f_1) \cup h^{-1}(\overline{B}^{(n)}(f_2))$ in $[x_{q_n}, x_{q_{n+1}}]$ is given by

Theorem 3.2. *Let f_1, f_2 be P-homeomorphisms with a finite number of break points and with identical irrational rotation numbers. Suppose that their total jumps do not coincide. For any positive integer r there exists a number $s_0 = s_0(r, n)$, $0 \leq s_0 \leq r(m_1 + m_2 + 1)$, such that*

1) $\max\limits_{x,y \in E^{(n)}_{s_0}, x \prec y} \ell([x, y]) \leq 2m_0^{-(s_0+r)} d_n$ *for every* $E^{(n)}_{s_0} \in \Gamma^{(n)}_{s_0}$;

2) $\ell(I) \geq m_0^{-s_0} d_n$, *for all* $I \in V^{(n)}_{s_0}$;

3) there exists at least one element $\widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0}$ *of the partition* $\Gamma^{(n)}_{s_0}$ *such that*

$$\prod_{b_1 : \overline{b}_1(n) \in \widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0}} \sigma_{f_1}(b_1) \neq \prod_{b_2 : \overline{b}_2(n) \in h(\widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0})} \sigma_{f_2}(b_2). \tag{3.3}$$

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Consider the partitions $D^{(n)}_0$, $D^{(n)}_r$, ..., $D^{(n)}_{r(m_1+m_2+1)}$ and the partitions $\Gamma^{(n)}_0$, $\Gamma^{(n)}_r$, ..., $\Gamma^{(n)}_{r(m_1+m_2+1)}$ of the set $B^{(n)}_{m_1,m_2}$ generated by them. Let $|\Gamma^{(n)}_l|$ denote the number of elements of the partition $\Gamma^{(n)}_l$. For proving the first two assertions of the theorem it is sufficient to show that $|\Gamma^{(n)}_{s_0}| = |\Gamma^{(n)}_{s_0+r}|$, for some s_0.

It follows from the structure of the partitions $\Gamma^{(n)}_l$ that $|\Gamma^{(n)}_l| \leq |\Gamma^{(n)}_{l+1}|$ for any $l \geq 0$. In particular, $|\Gamma^{(n)}_0| \leq |\Gamma^{(n)}_r| \leq ... \leq |\Gamma^{(n)}_{r(m_1+m_2+1)}|$. Then two cases are possible: either

$|\Gamma_{rt_0}^{(n)}| = |\Gamma_{r(t_0+1)}^{(n)}|$ for some $t_0 = t_0(n)$, $0 \le t_0 \le m_1 + m_2$, or $|\Gamma_0^{(n)}| < |\Gamma_r^{(n)}| < ... < |\Gamma_{r(m_1+m_2+1)}^{(n)}|$. In the first case we set $s_0 = rt_0$. If $|\Gamma_0^{(n)}| < |\Gamma_r^{(n)}| < ... < |\Gamma_{r(m_1+m_2+1)}^{(n)}|$, then, because $|\Gamma_0^{(n)}| \ge 2$, we obtain $|\Gamma_{r(m_1+m_2+1)}^{(n)}| \ge m_1 + m_2 + 3$. But on the other hand $|\Gamma_{r(m_1+m_2+1)}^{(n)}| \le |B_{m_1,m_2}^{(n)}| = m_1 + m_2 + 3$. Consequently, $|\Gamma_{r(m_1+m_2+1)}^{(n)}| = m_1 + m_2 + 3$, and hence the number of elements of $\Gamma_{r(m_1+m_2+1)}^{(n)}$ coincides with the number of elements of $B_{m_1,m_2}^{(n)}$. In other words, every element of the partition $\Gamma_{r(m_1+m_2+1)}^{(n)}$ contains only one element of $B_{m_1,m_2}^{(n)}$. Hence, $|\Gamma_s^{(n)}| = m_1 + m_2 + 3$ for all $s \ge r(m_1 + m_2 + 1)$. We can take $r(m_1 + m_2 + 1)$ as s_0. It follows from the construction that the number s_0 depends on n but does not exceed $r(m_1 + m_2 + 1)$. The first and second claims of Theorem 3.2 are therefore proved. Assume, that for every element $E_{s_0}^{(n)}$ of the partition $\Gamma_{s_0}^{(n)}$ the relation

$$\prod_{b_1:\overline{b}_1(n)\in E_{s_0}^{(n)}} \sigma_{f_1}(b_1) = \prod_{b_2:\overline{b}_2(n)\in h(E_{s_0}^{(n)})} \sigma_{f_2}(b_2),$$

holds. In this case,

$$\prod_{b_1\in B(f_1)} \sigma_{f_1}(b_1) = \prod_{b_2\in B(f_2)} \sigma_{f_2}(b_2).$$

in contradiction to the assumption in Theorem 3.2. This concludes the proof of Theorem 3.2.

4 Jump coverings of the circle homeomorphisms with break points

We consider two P-homeomorphisms f_1 and f_2 with identical irrational rotation number $\rho = \rho_{f_1} = \rho_{f_2}$. Suppose that f_1 and f_2 has m_1 respectively m_2 break points. Denote by $B(f_i), i = 1, 2$ the sets of all break points of f_i : $B(f_1) = \{b_1^{(i)},\ 1 \le i \le m_1\}$ and $B(f_2) = \{b_2^{(i)},\ i = \overline{1, m_2}\}$

Next we introduce the notion of a "regular" cover of $B(f_1) \cup h^{-1}(B(f_2))$, that is the union of the set of break points of f_1 and the h-preimage of the set of break points of f_2.

Let $z_i \in S^1$, $i = \overline{1, 4}$, $z_1 \prec z_2 \prec z_3 \prec z_4 \prec z_1$ and let r_n take values in the set $\{q_{n-1}, q_n, q_{n-1} + q_n\}$. Suppose furthermore that the interval $[z_1, z_4]$ is r_n-small, i. e. the intervals $\{f_1^j([z_1, z_4]),\ 0 \le j \le r_n - 1\}$, are pairwise disjoint. Suppose that the system of intervals $\{f_1^j([z_1, z_4]),\ 0 \le j \le r_n - 1\}$, covers the elements of some non-empty subset $\widehat{B}_1 \subset B(f_1)$ with $\widehat{B}_1 = \{b_1^{(i_s)},\ 1 \le s \le p_1\}$. For every element $b_1^{(i_s)} \in \widehat{B}_1$ there exists then a number $l_1^{(i_s)}$, $0 \le l_1^{(i_s)} \le r_n - 1$, such that $\overline{b}_1^{(i_s)}(n) = f_1^{-l_1^{(i_s)}}(b_1^{(i_s)}) \in [z_1, z_4]$. The point $\overline{b}_1^{(i_s)}(n)$ is called the r_n-preimage of the element $b_1^{(i_s)}$ in $[z_1, z_4]$. The set of r_n-preimages of elements of $\widehat{B}_1$ consists then of the elements $\overline{b}_1^{(i_1)}(n), \overline{b}_1^{(i_2)}(n), ..., \overline{b}_1^{(i_{p_1})}(n)$.

Define

$$\xi_{f_1}(j) := \frac{\ell([f_1^j(z_2), f_1^j(z_3)])}{\ell([f_1^j(z_1), f_1^j(z_2)])},\ z_{f_1}^{(i_s)}(j) := \frac{\ell([f_1^j(\overline{b}_1^{(i_s)}(n)), f_1^j(z_2)])}{\ell([f_1^j(z_1), f_1^j(z_2)])},\ 1 \le s \le p_1,\ 0 \le j < r_n.$$

It follows easily from Lemma 2.2 that

$$e^{-v}\xi_{f_1}(0) \le \xi_{f_1}(j) \le e^v\xi_{f_1}(0),\ e^{-v}z_{f_1}^{(i_s)}(0) \le z_{f_1}^{(i_s)}(j) \le e^v z_{f_1}^{(i_s)}(0),\ 1 \le s \le p_1, \tag{4.1}$$

and all $1 \le j \le r_n - 1$. For the further discussion we introduce some definitions.

Definition 4.1. *Let $K > M \ge 1$, $\zeta \in (0,1)$, $\delta > 0$ be constant numbers, let n be a positive integer, and let $x_0 \in S^1$. We say that a triple of intervals $([z_1, z_2], [z_2, z_3], [z_3, z_4])$, $z_i \in S^1$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, covers the break points in a subset $\widehat{B}_1$ "$(K, M, \delta, \zeta; x_0)$-regularly" , if for some $r_n \in \{q_{n-1}, q_n, q_n + q_{n-1}\}$ the following conditions hold:*

1) $[z_1, z_4] \subset (x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta)$, and the system of intervals $\{f_1^j([z_1, z_4]),\ 0 \le j \le r_n - 1\}$ covers every point in $\widehat{B}_1$ only once;

2) $\overline{b}_1^{(i_s)}(n) \in [z_1, z_2],\ 1 \le s \le p_1$;

3) $M\ell([z_1, z_2]) \le \ell([z_2, z_3]) \le K\ell([z_1, z_2]),\ K^{-1}\ell([z_3, z_4]) \le \ell([z_2, z_3]) \le K\ell([z_3, z_4])$;

4) The lengths of the intervals $f_1^{r_n}([z_1, z_2])$, $f_1^{r_n}([z_2, z_3])$ and $f_1^{r_n}([z_3, z_4])$ are pairwise K-comparable;

5) $\max\{\ell([f_1^{r_n}(z_i), x_0]), \ell([z_i, x_0]), i = \overline{1,4}\} \le K\ell([z_1, z_2])$;

6) $\max\limits_{1 \le s \le p_1} \{z_{f_1}^{(i_s)}(0)\} < \zeta$.

Definition 4.2. *Let $\widehat{B}_1$ and $\widehat{B}_2$ be subsets of the break points of the homeomorphisms f_1 and f_2, respectively. The subsets $\widehat{B}_1$ and $\widehat{B}_2$ are said to be **"not jump-coinciding"**, or for short **"not coinciding"**,if*

$$\prod_{b_1 \in \widehat{B}_1} \sigma_{f_1}(b_1) \ne \prod_{b_2 \in \widehat{B}_2} \sigma_{f_2}(b_2).$$

*Otherwise we call them **"coinciding"***

It is clear, that if $\widehat{B}_1$ and $\widehat{B}_2$ are "not jump-coinciding" subsets, then one of subsets $\widehat{B}_1$ and $\widehat{B}_2$ is non-empty. For instance, if $\widehat{B}_1$ is empty, then we put $\prod\limits_{b_1 \in \widehat{B}_1} \sigma_{f_1}(b_1) := 1$.

Definition 4.3. *Let $\widehat{B}_1$ and $\widehat{B}_2$ be subsets of the break points of f_1 and f_2 respectively. We say that the triples of intervals $([z_s, z_{s+1}],\ s = 1, 2, 3)$ and $([h(z_s), h(z_{s+1})],\ s = 1, 2, 3)$ cover the subsets $\widehat{B}_1$ and $\widehat{B}_2$ "$(K, M, \delta, \zeta; x_0, h(x_0))$- regularly" with $r_n \in \{q_{n-1}, q_n, q_n + q_{n-1}\}$, if*

- *the triples of intervals $([z_s, z_{s+1}],\ s = 1, 2, 3)$ and $([h(z_s), h(z_{s+1})],\ s = 1, 2, 3)$ cover the points of $\widehat{B}_1$ respectively $\widehat{B}_2$ "$(K, M, \delta, \zeta; x_0)$- regularly" respectively "$(K, M, \delta, \zeta; h(x_0))$-regularly" if $\widehat{B}_1 \ne \emptyset,\ \widehat{B}_2 \ne \emptyset$;*

- *the triple of intervals $([z_s, z_{s+1}],\ s = 1, 2, 3)$ covers the points of $\widehat{B}_1$ "$(K, M, \delta, \zeta; x_0)$-regularly" if $\widehat{B}_1 \ne \emptyset,\ \widehat{B}_2 = \emptyset$;*

- *the triple intervals $([h(z_s), h(z_{s+1})],\ s = 1, 2, 3)$ covers the points of $\widehat{B}_2$ "$(K, M, \delta, \zeta;$ $h(x_0))$-regularly" if $\widehat{B}_1 = \emptyset,\ \widehat{B}_2 \ne \emptyset$.*

Next we formulate our main Theorem on the covering of intervals which plays a key role in the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Theorem 4.4. *Suppose that the homeomorphisms f_1 and f_2 satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1.5. Let $Dh(x_0) = \omega_0 > 0$ for some $x_0 \in S^1$ and let $M \geq 1$, ζ, $\delta \in (0,1)$ be constants. Then there exist a constant $K = K(f_1, f_2, M, \zeta) > M$ and for any sufficiently large n "not jump-coinciding" subsets $\widehat{B}_1$ and $\widehat{B}_2$, points $z_i \in S^1$, $1 \leq i \leq 4$ with $z_1 \prec z_2 \prec z_3 \prec z_4 \prec z_1$ and a number $r_n = r_n(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) \in \{q_{n-1}, q_n, q_n + q_{n-1}\}$, such that the triples of intervals $([z_s, z_{s+1}],\ s = 1,2,3)$ and $([h(z_s), h(z_{s+1})],\ s = 1,2,3)$ cover the subsets $\widehat{B}_1$ and $\widehat{B}_2$ "$(K, M, \delta, \zeta; x_0, h(x_0))$-regularly" for r_n.*

Proof of Theorem 4.4. Suppose that the homeomorphisms f_1 and f_2 satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.5. Let $B(f_1) = \{b_1^{(i)},\ 1 \leq i \leq m_1\}$ and $B(f_2) = \{b_2^{(j)},\ 1 \leq j \leq m_2\}$ be the sets of break points of f_1 and f_2 respectively. By assumption $Dh(x_0) = \omega_0 > 0$ for some $x_0 \in S^1$. Consider the dynamical partition $\eta_n(x_0)$ of the point x_0 under f_1. Suppose n to be odd. Let $B^{(n)}_{m_1,m_2}$ and d_n be defined as in (3.2).

Define the number m_0 by using the constants $M > 1$, $\zeta \in (0,1)$ and the total variation v_i of the functions $\ln Df_i$, $i = 1,2$ as follows:

$$m_0 := \max\{m_1 + m_2 + 4,\ [M\zeta^{-1}] + 1,\ [e^{v_1}] + 1,\ [e^{v_2}] + 1\}, \tag{4.2}$$

where $[\cdot]$ denotes the integer part, and consider the partition $D_l^{(n)}$ of the interval $[x_{q_n}, x_{q_{n-1}}]$. It is sufficient to use the assertion of Theorem 3.2 with $r = 9$ and set $s_0 = s_0(9,n)$. By this assertion there exists at least one element $\widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0} \in \Gamma^{(n)}_{s_0}$ such that

$$\prod_{b_1 : \overline{b}_1(n) \in \widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0}} \sigma_{f_1}(b_1) \neq \prod_{b_2 : \overline{b}_2(n) \in h(\widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0})} \sigma_{f_2}(b_2).$$

Set $\widehat{B}_1 := \{b_1^{(i)} : \overline{b}_1^{(i)}(n) \in \widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0}\}$ and $\widehat{B}_2 := \{b_2^{(j)} : \overline{b}_2^{(j)}(n) \in h(\widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0})\}$. Then the following cases are possible: $\widehat{B}_1 \neq \emptyset, \widehat{B}_2 \neq \emptyset$ or $\widehat{B}_1 \neq \emptyset, \widehat{B}_2 = \emptyset$ or $\widehat{B}_1 = \emptyset, \widehat{B}_2 \neq \emptyset$. If $\widehat{B}_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $\widehat{B}_2 \neq \emptyset$ we'll construct a triple of regular covering intervals $[z_s, z_{s+1}]$, $s = 1,2,3$, in the other cases the construction of regular covering intervals is analogous.

Let $\widehat{B}_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $\widehat{B}_2 \neq \emptyset$. Then three cases are possible for the set $\widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0}$.

(c_1) $\widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0}$ does not contain any elements of $\{x_{q_n},\ x_0,\ x_{q_{n-1}}\}$;

(c_2) $\widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0}$ contains only one element of the set $\{x_{q_n},\ x_0,\ x_{q_{n-1}}\}$;

(c_3) $\widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0}$ contains the elements x_{q_n}, x_0 of the set $\{x_{q_n},\ x_0,\ x_{q_{n-1}}\}$.

The case $\{x_{q_{n-1}},\ x_0\} \in \widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0}$ turns out to be impossible.

We prove the assertion of the theorem in each of the cases separately.

(c_1). Let $\widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0} \cap \{x_{q_n},\ x_0,\ x_{q_{n-1}}\} = \emptyset$. Then either $\widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0} \subset (x_{q_n}, x_0)$, or $\widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0} \subset (x_0, x_{q_{n-1}})$. Suppose for definiteness that $\widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0} \subset (x_0, x_{q_{n-1}})$. The case $\widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0} \subset (x_{q_n}, x_0)$ can be treated in a similar way.

One can deduce from the assertion of Theorem 3.2 that the subset $\widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0}$ is covered by one or two intervals of the partition $D^{(n)}_{s_0}$. The union of the intervals of the partition $D^{(n)}_{s_0}$ which cover $\widetilde{E}^{(n)}_{s_0}$ is denoted by $I^{(n)}_{s_0}$. In the same way we can define intervals $I^{(n)}_{s_0+p}$ for $0 < p < 9$. Clearly $I^{(n)}_{s_0} \supset I^{(n)}_{s_0+1} ... \supset I^{(n)}_{s_0+9}$. It follows from the assertion of Theorem 3.2 that the interval $I^{(n)}_{s_0}$ is adjacent on the left and right to two $s_0^{(n)}$-empty intervals of $D^{(n)}_{s_0}$ contained in the interval $(x_0, x_{q_{n-1}})$. These two intervals are denoted by $L^{(n)}_{s_0}$ and $R^{(n)}_{s_0}$, respectively.

We now define the points z_i, $1 \le i \le 4$, as follows:

$$z_2 = \max\{y : y \in \widetilde{E}_{s_0}^{(n)}\},\ \ z_1 = z_2 - d_n m_0^{-(s_0+7)},\ \ z_3 = z_2 + d_n m_0^{-(s_0+6)},$$

$$z_4 = z_2 + d_n m_0^{-(s_0+6)} + d_n m_0^{-(s_0+7)}. \tag{4.3}$$

We now verify that the triples of intervals $[z_s, z_{s+1}]$, $s = 1, 2, 3$ and $[h(z_s), h(z_{s+1})]$, $s = 1, 2, 3$ satisfy the conditions of Definition 4.1. The length of the interval $I_{s_0+9}^{(n)}$ covering the subset $\widetilde{E}_{s_0}^{(n)}$ does not exceed $2d_n m_0^{-(s_0+9)}$, and the lengths of the intervals $L_{s_0}^{(n)}$ and $R_{s_0}^{(n)}$ adjacent to $I_{s_0}^{(n)}$ are equal to $d_n \cdot m_0^{-s_0}$. Using the definition of the points $z_i, 0 \le i \le 4$ we obtain $\ell([z_1, z_2]) = m_0^{-7}\ell(L_{s_0}^{(n)})$, $\ell([z_2, z_4]) = (m_0+1)m_0^{-7}\ell(R_{s_0}^{(n)})$. Hence, $[z_1, z_4] \subset L_{s_0}^{(n)} \cup I_{s_0}^{(n)} \cup R_{s_0}^{(n)} \subset (x_0, x_{q_{n-1}})$. Since the interval $[x_0, x_{q_{n-1}}]$ is q_n-small, the intervals $\{f_1^j([z_1, z_4]),\ 0 \le j \le q_n - 1\}$ are pairwise disjoint and cover each point of $\widehat{B}_1$ only once. One can easily verify that the intervals $[z_s, z_{s+1}]$, $s = 1, 2, 3$ satisfy condition 2) of Definition 4.1. By Denjoy's inequality the intervals $[x_{q_n}, x_{q_{n-1}}]$ and $[x_0, x_{q_{n-1}}]$ are $1 + e^{v_1}$-comparable. Hence, using the fact that $\ell([z_1, z_4]) = (m_0+2)m_0^{-(s_0+7)}d_n$, we obtain that $[z_1, z_4]$ and $[x_0, x_{q_{n-1}}]$ are $(m_0+2)^{-1}m_0^{(s_0+7)}(1+e^{v_1})^{-1}$- comparable. Set $K := \max\{m_0 e^{2(v_1+v_2)}, m_0^{s_0+7},\ n = 1, 2, ...\}$, where $s_0 = s_0(9, n)$. By the assertion of Theorem 3.2 we have $s_0 = s_0(9, n) \le 9(m_1 + m_2 + 1)$, $\forall n \in N$. Consequently, $K = \max\{m_0 e^{2(v_1+v_2)}, m_0^{9(m_1+m_2)+16}\}$. Taking into account that $m_0 > M$ we conclude that the intervals $[z_s, z_{s+1}]$, $s = 1, 2, 3$, satisfy condition 3) of Definition 4.1 with the constant K. By Denjoy's inequality the intervals $[z_s, z_{s+1}]$ and $[f_1^{q_n}(z_s), f_1^{q_n}(z_{s+1})]$ are e^{v_1}-comparable for every $s = 1, 2, 3$. Since $\ell([z_s, z_{s+1}]) = d_n \cdot m_0^{-(s_0+7)}$, $s = 1, 3$ and $\ell([z_2, z_3]) = d_n \cdot m_0^{-(s_0+6)}$, it follows that the intervals $[f_1^{q_n}(z_s), f_1^{q_n}(z_{s+1})]$, $s = 1, 2, 3$, satisfy condition 4) of Definition 4.1 with the constant K.

Obviously,

$$\max_{1\le i\le 4} \ell([z_i, x_0]),\ \max_{1\le i\le 4} \ell([f_1^{q_n}(z_i), x_0]) \le \ell([x_{q_n}, x_{q_{n-1}}]) = d_n.$$

It follows from the explicit form of the length of the interval $\ell([z_1, z_2])$ that $d_n = m_0^{s_0+7}$ $\ell([z_1, z_2])$. Hence it is evident that $[z_s, z_{s+1}]$, $s = 1, 2, 3$, satisfy condition 5) of Definition 4.1 with the constant K. We now verify that the triple of intervals $[z_s, z_{s+1}]$, $s = 1, 2, 3$, satisfy condition 6) of Definition 4.1. It follows from the definition of the points z_s, $s = 1, 2, 3, 4$, that

$$\max_{i:\overline{b}_1^{(i)}(n)\in\widetilde{E}_{s_0}^{(n)}} \frac{\ell([\overline{b}_1^{(i)}(n), z_2])}{\ell([z_1, z_2])} \le \frac{d_n \cdot m_0^{-(s_0+8)}}{d_n \cdot m_0^{-(s_0+7)}} = m_0^{-1} < \zeta.$$

Next we show that the intervals $[h(z_s), h(z_{s+1})]$, $s = 1, 2, 3$, define a regular cover of the elements of the set $\widehat{B}_2$. The definition of the points z_i, $1 \le i \le 4$ implies that $[h(z_1), h(z_4)] \subset [h(x_0), f_2^{q_{n-1}}(h(x_0))] \subset (h(x_0) - \delta, h(x_0) + \delta)$ for sufficiently large n and the system of intervals $\{f_2^j([h(z_1), h(z_4)]), 0 \le j < q_n\}$ are pairwise disjoint and cover each point of the subset $\widehat{B}_2$ only once. Since $\widetilde{E}_{s_0}^{(n)} \subset [z_1, z_4]$, the elements of the set $\widehat{B}_2$ are covered by f_2- iterations of the interval $[h(z_1), h(z_2)]$. By the assumption of Theorem 4.4 $Dh(x_0) = \omega_0 > 0$ at the point $x_0 \in S^1$.

Let $H(x)$ be the lift of h. By the definition of the derivative, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta_1 = \delta_1(x_0, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that for all $x \in (x_0 - \delta_1, x_0 + \delta_1)$ the inequality

$$\omega_0 - \varepsilon < \frac{H(x) - H(x_0)}{x - x_0} < \omega_0 + \varepsilon. \tag{4.4}$$

holds. For $x = \hat{z}_i,\ 1 \le i \le 4$, it follows from (4.4) that

$$(\omega_0 - \varepsilon)(x_0 - \hat{z}_i) < H(x_0) - H(\hat{z}_i) < (\omega_0 + \varepsilon)(x_0 - \hat{z}_i), \tag{4.5}$$

from which one can easily derive the inequalities

$$\omega_0 - \varepsilon\frac{(x_0 - \hat{z}_{i+1}) + (x_0 - \hat{z}_i)}{\hat{z}_{i+1} - \hat{z}_i} < \frac{H(\hat{z}_{i+1}) - H(\hat{z}_i)}{\hat{z}_{i+1} - \hat{z}_i} <$$

$$< \omega_0 + \varepsilon\frac{(x_0 - \hat{z}_{i+1}) + (x_0 - \hat{z}_i)}{\hat{z}_{i+1} - \hat{z}_i},\ i = 1, 2, 3, \tag{4.6}$$

where $(\hat{z}_1, \hat{z}_2, \hat{z}_3, \hat{z}_4)$ is the lifted vector of (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4). Using the definition of the points z_i, $1 \le i \le 4$, we obtain

$$\max_{1 \le i \le 3} \{\tfrac{x_0 - \hat{z}_{i+1}}{\hat{z}_{i+1} - \hat{z}_i}, \tfrac{x_0 - \hat{z}_i}{\hat{z}_{i+1} - \hat{z}_i}\} < K. \tag{4.7}$$

Using the definition of m_0 and the bounds (4.6),(4.7) it can be easily shown that the intervals $[h(z_s), h(z_{s+1})],\ s = 1, 2, 3$ satisfy the other conditions of Definition 4.1 with the same constant K.

(c_2). We denote by $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_n})$, $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_0)$ and $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}})$ the elements of the partition $\Gamma_{s_0}^{(n)}$ containing just one of the points x_{q_n}, x_0 or $x_{q_{n-1}}$, and which are pairwise disjoint. By assumption, $\widetilde{E}_{s_0}^{(n)}$ coincides with one of them and these subsets are pairwise disjoint. Suppose, that for any element $E_{s_0}^{(n)} \in \Gamma_{s_0}^{(n)}$, which does not contain the points x_{q_n}, x_0, $x_{q_{n-1}}$ the following relation hold:

$$\prod_{b_1 : \overline{b}_1(n) \in E_{s_0}^{(n)}} \sigma_{f_1}(b_1) = \prod_{b_2 : \overline{b}_2(n) \in h(E_{s_0}^{(n)})} \sigma_{f_2}(b_2).$$

Otherwise we arrive again at case (c_1). Then the sets $\widetilde{B}_1 = \{b_1^{(i)} : \overline{b}_1^{(i)}(n) \in E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_n}) \cup E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_0) \cup E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}})\}$ and $\widetilde{B}_2 = \{b_2^{(i)} : h^{-1}(\overline{b}_2^{(i)}(n)) \in E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_n}) \cup E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_0) \cup E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}})\}$ are "not coinciding".

Denote by $I_{s_0+p}^{(n)}(x_{q_n})$, $I_{s_0+p}^{(n)}(x_0)$ and $I_{s_0+p}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}})$ be the intervals of partition $D_{s_0+p}^{(n)}$, $1 \le p \le 9$, covering $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_n})$, $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_0)$ and $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}})$, respectively. By Theorem 3.2 the interval $I_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_0)$ is adjacent on both sides to $s_0^{(n)}$-empty intervals of length $d_n m_0^{-s_0}$. Consider then the subset $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_n}, x_0, x_{q_{n-1}}) := f_1^{-q_n}(E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_n})) \cup E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_0) \cup f_1^{-q_{n-1}}(E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}}))$. From Denjoy's inequality we get $\ell(f_1^{-q_n}(I_{s_0+9}^{(n)}(x_{q_n}))),\ \ell(f_1^{-q_{n-1}}(I_{s_0+9}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}}))) \le e^{v_1} d_n m_0^{-(s_0+9)}$. Hence, $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_n}, x_0, x_{q_{n-1}}) \subset (x_0 - 2e^{v_1} d_n m_0^{-(s_0+9)}, x_0 + 2e^{v_1} d_n m_0^{-(s_0+9)})$.

We can define now the points z_i, $1 \le i \le 4$, as follows

$$z_2 = \max E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_n}, x_0, x_{q_{n-1}}),\ z_1 = z_2 - d_n m_0^{-(s_0+6)},\ z_3 = z_2 + d_n m_0^{-(s_0+3)},$$

$$z_4 = z_2 + d_n m_0^{-(s_0+3)} + d_n m_0^{-(s_0+6)}. \tag{4.8}$$

We claim, the triple of intervals $[z_s, z_{s+1}]$, $s = 1, 2, 3$ covers the point of the subset $\widetilde{B}_1$ "$(K, M, \delta, \zeta; x_0)$-regularly" with $r_n = q_n + q_{n-1}$.

We verify only that the system of intervals $\{f_1^i([z_1, z_4]),\ 0 \le i \le q_n + q_{n-1} - 1\}$ covers each point of the subset $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_n}, x_0, x_{q_{n-1}})$ only once. The other conditions in Definition 4.1 concerning the lengths of the intervals can be verified as in the case (c_1) by simple calculations . We divide the interval $[z_1, z_4]$ up into $[z_1, z_4] = [z_1, x_0] \cup (x_0, z_4]$. We claim, the intervals $f_1^i([z_1, x_0])$, $0 \le i \le q_n + q_{n-1} - 1$, cover the break points of f_1 with q_{n-1}-preimages in $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_0) \cap [z_1, x_0]$ and with q_n-preimages in $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}})$ only once. Since $[z_1, x_0] \subset [x_{q_n}, x_0]$, the intervals $f_1^i([z_1, x_0])$, $0 \le i \le q_{n-1} - 1$, cover each break point of f_1 with q_n-preimage in $[z_1, x_0] \cap E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_0)$ only once. It follows from the assertion of Theorem 3.2 that there is an s_0-empty interval to the left of $I_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_n})$. By Denjoy's inequality the length of the interval $f_1^{q_{n-1}}([z_1, x_0]) = [f_1^{q_{n-1}}(z_1), x_{q_{n-1}}]$ is at most $e^{v_1}\ell([z_1, x_0])$. It is easy to verify that this number is less than the sum of the lengths of the intervals $I_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}})$ and the adjacent $s_0^{(n)}$-empty one. In other words, $[f_1^{q_{n-1}}(z_1), x_{q_{n-1}}]$ is covered by the interval $I_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}})$ and an $s_0^{(n)}$-empty adjacent interval. Clearly, the subset of the q_n- preimages of the break points of f_1 contained in $[f_1^{q_{n-1}}(z_1), x_{q_{n-1}}]$ coincides with $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}})$. Since $[f_1^{q_{n-1}}(z_1), x_{q_{n-1}}] \subset [x_0, x_{q_{n-1}}]$, the intervals $f_1^i([f_1^{q_{n-1}}(z_1), x_{q_{n-1}}])$, $0 \le i \le q_n - 1$, cover the break points with q_n-preimages in $[f_1^{q_{n-1}}(z_1), x_{q_{n-1}}]$ only once.

It can be shown in a similar way that the intervals $f_1^i((x_0, z_4])$, $0 \le i \le q_n + q_{n-1} - 1$, cover the break points of f_1 with q_n-preimages in $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_0) \cap (x_0, z_4]$ respectively q_{n-1}-preimages in $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_n})$ only once. Remember, ε to be an arbitrary positive number. Using this and the bounds (4.6),(4.7) it can be proved that the intervals $[h(z_s), h(z_{s+1})]$, $s = 1, 2, 3$ satisfy all the conditions of Definition 4.1 with the same constant K.

(c_3). First we show that the subset $\{x_0, x_{q_{n-1}}\}$ cannot be part of $\widetilde{E}_{s_0}^{(n)}$. Suppose on the contrary $\{x_0, x_{q_{n-1}}\} \subset \widetilde{E}_{s_0}^{(n)}$. Then $\widetilde{E}_{s_0}^{(n)}$ is covered by the interval $I_{s_0+9}^{(n)}$ of the partition $D_{s_0+9}^{(n)}$. Consequently $\Delta_0^{(n-1)} \subset I_{s_0+9}^{(n)}$. Clearly, $\ell(\Delta_0^{(n-1)}) \le m_0^{-(s_0+9)} d_n$. Hence, $\ell(\Delta_0^{(n)}) \ge (m_0^{(s_0+9)} - 1)\ell(\Delta_0^{(n-1)})$. From Denjoy's inequality we get $\ell(\Delta_0^{(n)}) \le e^v \ell(\Delta_0^{(n-1)})$. Using the definition of m_0, one can easily show that $m_0^{(s_0+9)} - 1 > e^{v_1}$. Consequently, $\ell(\Delta_0^{(n)}) > \ell(\Delta_0^{(n)})$, a contradiction.

By assumption (c_3) $x_{q_n}, x_0 \in \widetilde{E}_{s_0}^{(n)}$. The definition of the subsets $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_n})$ and $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_0)$ imply that $\widetilde{E}_{s_0}^{(n)} = E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_0) = E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_n})$.

We divide the set $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}}) \setminus \{x_{q_{n-1}}\}$ up into two subsets A_1 and A_2:

1)$A_1 = \{\overline{b}_1, h^{-1}(\overline{b}_2) : \overline{b}_1, h^{-1}(\overline{b}_2) \in E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}}),\ f_1^j(\overline{b}_1)$ and $f_2^s(\overline{b}_2)$ are break points of f_1 and f_2, respectively for some j, s with $q_n - q_{n-1} \le j, s < q_{n-1}\}$;

2)$A_2 = \{\overline{b}_1, h^{-1}(\overline{b}_2) : \overline{b}_1, h^{-1}(\overline{b}_2) \in E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}}),\ f_1^i(\overline{b}_1)$ and $f_2^k(\overline{b}_2)$ are break points of f_1 and f_2, respectively for some i, k, with $0 < i, k \le q_n - q_{n-1} - 1\}$.

Let $I_{s_0+p}^{(n)}(x_0)$ and $I_{s_0+p}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}})$, $0 \le p \le 9$, be the intervals of partition $D_{s_0+p}^{(n)}$ covering $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_0)$ and $E_{s_0}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}})$, respectively. By the definition of the partition $D_l^{(n)}$ we have

$$\ell(I_{s_0+p}^{(n)}(x_0)) = \ell(I_{s_0+p}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}})) = d_n m_0^{-(s_0+p)},\ 0 \le p \le 9. \tag{4.9}$$

From Denjoy's lemma it folows that

$$\ell(f^{q_n - q_{n-1}}(I_{s_0+9}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}}))),\ \ell(f^{-q_{n-1}}(I_{s_0+9}^{(n)}(x_{q_{n-1}}))) < d_n m_0^{-(s_0+7)}. \tag{4.10}$$

We set $E^{(n)}_{s_0}(x_0, x_{q_{n-1}}) := E^{(n)}_{s_0}(x_0) \cup f_1^{q_n - q_{n-1}}(A_1) \cup f_1^{-q_{n-1}}(A_2)$. Obviously, $E^{(n)}_{s_0}(x_0, x_{q_{n-1}}) \subset H^{(n)}_{s_0+9} := I^{(n)}_{s_0+9}(x_0) \cup f_1^{q_n - q_{n-1}}(I^{(n)}_{s_0+9}(x_{q_{n-1}})) \cup f_1^{-q_{n-1}}(I^{(n)}_{s_0+9}(x_{q_{n-1}}))$. This fact together with relations (4.9) and (4.10), implies that $\ell(H^{(n)}_{s_0+9}) < 2d_n m_0^{-(s_0+7)}$. We can now define points z_i, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ as follows:

$$z_2 = \max E^{(n)}_{s_0}(x_0, x_{q_{n-1}}),\ z_1 = z_2 - 2d_n m_0^{-(s_0+6)},\ z_3 = z_2 + 2d_n m_0^{-(s_0+4)},$$

$$z_4 = z_2 + d_n m_0^{-(s_0+4)} + d_n m_0^{-(s_0+6)}. \tag{4.11}$$

We claim that the triples of intervals $([z_s, z_{s+1}], s = 1, 2, 3)$ and $([h(z_2), h(z_3)], s = 1, 2, 3)$ cover the points of the "not coinciding" sets $\widetilde{B}_1 = \{b_1^{(i)} : \overline{b}_1^{(i)}(n) \in E^{(n)}_{s_0}(x_0) \cup E^{(n)}_{s_0}(x_{q_{n-1}})\}$ and $\widetilde{B}_2 = \{b_2^{(i)} : h^{-1}(\overline{b}_2^{(i)}(n)) \in E^{(n)}_{s_0}(x_0) \cup E^{(n)}_{s_0}(x_{q_{n-1}})\}$ "$(K, M, \delta, \zeta; x_0, h(x_0))$-regularly" with $r_n = q_n$.

We shall only show that condition 1) in Definition 4.1 holds, the other conditions can easily be verified as in case (c_1). We again divide the interval $[z_1, z_4]$ up into $[z_1, z_4] = [z_1, x_0] \cup [x_0, z_4]$ and decompose the system of intervals $\{f_1^i([z_1, x_0]),\ 0 \le i \le q_n - 1\}$ into two subsystems: $\{f_1^i([z_1, x_0]),\ 0 \le i \le q_{n-1} - 1\}$ and $\{f_1^i([z_1, x_0]),\ q_{n-1} \le i \le q_n - 1\}$. Clearly, the first subsystem covers those break points of f_1 whose q_{n-1}- preimages are contained in the interval $[x_{q_n}, x_0]$, as well as those whose q_n-pre- images form the subset A_1, only once. Note, that the break points of f_1 with q_n-preimages in A_2 are covered by the second system of intervals only once. Consider then the system of intervals $\{f_1^i([x_0, z_4]),\ 0 \le i \le q_n - 1\}$. It follows from the definition of z_4 that $[x_0, z_4] \subset [x_0, x_{q_{n-1}}]$. Then two cases are possible for the point z_2: either $z_2 > x_0$ or $z_2 \le x_0$. If $z_2 > x_0$, then the break points with q_n-preimages contained in $[x_0, z_2]$ are covered by the system of intervals $\{f_1^i([x_0, z_4]),\ 0 \le i \le q_n - 1\}$ only once. In the case $z_2 < x_0$, the interval $[x_0, z_4]$ does not contain any q_n-preimages of break points of f_1. Notice that the orbits $\{f_1^k(x_0),\ k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and $\{f_2^k(h(x_0)),\ k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, of any point $x_0 \in S^1$ has the same order on the circle. This together with (4.6) and (4.7) implies that the intervals $[h(z_s), h(z_{s+1})],\ s = 1, 2, 3$ also satisfy the conditions of Definition 4.1 with the same constant K. Hence the theorem is completely proved.

5 Proof of the Theorem 1.5

Consider two copies of the circle S^1, and homeomorphisms f_1 and f_2 with $m_1, m_2 \ge 2$ break points respectively and identical irrational rotation number ρ. Denote by $B(f_1) = \{b_1^{(i)}, 1 \le i \le m_1\}$ and $B(f_2) = \{b_2^{(j)}, 1 \le j \le m_2\}$ the set of break points of f_1 respectively f_2. Assume that f_1 and f_2 satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.5. Let h be the conjugacy between f_1 and f_2. For the proof of Theorem 1.5 we need several lemmas.

Lemma 5.1. *(see [6]). Assume, that the conjugating homeomorphism $h(x)$ has a positive derivative $Dh(x_0) = \omega_0$ at some point $x_0 \in S^1$, and that the following conditions hold for the points $z_i \in S^1$, $i = 1, .., 4$, with $z_1 \prec z_2 \prec z_3 \prec z_4$, and some constant $R_1 > 1$:*

(a) the intervals $[z_1, z_2], [z_2, z_3], [z_3, z_4]$ are pairwise R_1-comparable;

(b) $\max\limits_{1 \le i \le 4} \ell([z_i, x_0]) \le R_1 \ell([z_1, z_2])$.

Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$|Dist(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4; h) - 1| \le C_3\varepsilon, \tag{5.1}$$

if $z_i \in (x_0 - \delta,\ x_0 + \delta)$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, where the constant $C_3 > 0$ depends only on R_1, ω_0 and not on ε.

We define the following functions on the domain $\{(x, y) : x > 0,\ 0 \le y \le 1\}$:

$$G^{(i)}_{f_1}(x, y) = \frac{[\sigma^{(i)}_{f_1} + (1 - \sigma^{(i)}_{f_1})y](1 + x)}{\sigma^{(i)}_{f_1} + (1 - \sigma^{(i)}_{f_1})y + x},\ 1 \le i \le m_1,$$

$$G^{(j)}_{f_2}(x, y) = \frac{[\sigma^{(j)}_{f_2} + (1 - \sigma^{(j)}_{f_2})y](1 + x)}{\sigma^{(j)}_{f_2} + (1 - \sigma^{(j)}_{f_2})y + x},\ 1 \le j \le m_2,$$

where the $\sigma^{(i)}_{f_1}$ and $\sigma^{(j)}_{f_2}$ are the jumps of f_1 and f_2 at the points $b^{(i)}_1$ and $b^{(j)}_2$ respectively.

Let $\widehat{B}_1 \subset B(f_1)$ and $\widehat{B}_2 \subset B(f_2)$. Denote

$$\sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1) := \prod_{b^{(i)}_1 \in \widehat{B}_1} \sigma_{f_1}(b^{(i)}_1),\ \sigma_{f_2}(\widehat{B}_2) := \prod_{b^{(j)}_2 \in \widehat{B}_2} \sigma_{f_2}(b^{(j)}_2),$$

$$\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2} := \min\{\sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1),\ \sigma_{f_2}(\widehat{B}_2),\ |\sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1) - \sigma_{f_2}(\widehat{B}_2)|\}.$$

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\widehat{B}_1 = \{b^{(i_1)}_1, b^{(i_2)}_1, ..., b^{(i_{p_1})}_1\}$ and $\widehat{B}_2 = \{b^{(j_1)}_2, b^{(j_2)}_2, ..., b^{(j_{p_2})}_2\}$ be arbitrary "not coinciding" subsets of the break points of f_1 and f_2. Then there exist constants $\Omega_0 > 1$ and $\vartheta_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that for arbitrary $x^{(s)}_{f_1},\ x^{(t)}_{f_2} \ge \Omega_0,\ y^{(s)}_{f_1},\ y^{(t)}_{f_2} \in [0, \vartheta_0),\ 1 \le s \le p_1,\ 1 \le t \le p_2$ the following inequality holds:*

$$|\prod_{s=1}^{p_1} G^{(i_s)}_{f_1}(x^{(s)}_{f_1}, y^{(s)}_{f_1}) - \sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1)| \le \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{8} \tag{5.2}$$

$$|\prod_{t=1}^{p_2} G^{(j_t)}_{f_2}(x^{(t)}_{f_2}, y^{(t)}_{f_2}) - \sigma_{f_2}(\widehat{B}_2)| \le \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{8}. \tag{5.3}$$

where Ω_0 and ϑ_0 only depend on $\sigma^{(i_s)}_{f_1}$, $1 \le s \le p_1$ and $\sigma^{(j_t)}_{f_2}$, $1 \le t \le p_2$

Proof of Lemma 5.2. Assume $\widehat{B}_1 = \{b^{(i_s)}_1,\ 1 \le s \le p_1\}$ and $\widehat{B}_2 = \{b^{(j_t)}_2,\ 1 \le t \le p_2\}$ are "not coinciding" subsets of the break points of f_1 and f_2, respectively. We rewrite $\prod\limits_{s=1}^{p_1} G^{(i_s)}_{f_1}(x^{(s)}_{f_1}, y^{(s)}_{f_1})$ in the form

$$\prod_{s=1}^{p_1} G^{(i_s)}_{f_1}(x^{(s)}_{f_1}, y^{(s)}_{f_1}) = \prod_{s=1}^{p_1} \frac{[\sigma^{(i_s)}_{f_1} + (1 - \sigma^{(i_s)}_{f_1})y^{(s)}_{f_1}](1 + x^{(s)}_{f_1})}{\sigma^{(i_s)}_{f_1} + (1 - \sigma^{(i_s)}_{f_1})y^{(s)}_{f_1} + x^{(s)}_{f_1}} =$$

$$\prod_{s=1}^{p_1}[\sigma^{(i_s)}_{f_1} + (1 - \sigma^{(i_s)}_{f_1})y^{(s)}_{f_1}] \times \prod_{s=1}^{p_1} \frac{1 + x^{(s)}_{f_1}}{\sigma^{(i_s)}_{f_1} + (1 - \sigma^{(i_s)}_{f_1})y^{(s)}_{f_1} + x^{(s)}_{f_1}} \equiv$$

$$\equiv \Phi_{f_1}^{(1)}(y_{f_1}^{(1)},...,y_{f_1}^{(p_1)}) \times \Phi_{f_1}^{(2)}(y_{f_1}^{(1)},...,y_{f_1}^{(p_1)},x_{f_1}^{(1)},...,x_{f_1}^{(p_1)}). \tag{5.4}$$

Obviously

$$\lim_{y_{f_1}^{(s)}\to 0,\, s=\overline{1,p_1}} \Phi_{f_1}^{(1)}(y_{f_1}^{(1)},...,y_{f_1}^{(p_1)}) = \sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1),$$

$$\lim_{x_{f_1}^{(s)}\to \infty,\, s=\overline{1,p_1}} \Phi_{f_1}^{(2)}(y_{f_1}^{(1)},...,y_{f_1}^{(p_1)},x_{f_1}^{(1)},...,x_{f_1}^{(p_1)}) = 1.$$

When the variables $y_{f_1}^{(s)}$, $1 \le s \le p_1$, are uniformly close to zero, the function $\Phi_{f_1}^{(1)} = \Phi_{f_1}^{(1)}(y_{f_1}^{(1)},...,y_{f_1}^{(p_1)})$ hence is close to $\sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1)$, while the function $\Phi_{f_1}^{(2)} = \Phi_{f_1}^{(2)}(y_{f_1}^{(1)},...,y_{f_1}^{(p_1)},x_{f_1}^{(1)},...,x_{f_1}^{(p_1)})$ is close 1 for large values of $x_{f_1}^{(s)}$, $1 \le s \le p_1$. Taking these remarks into account and using the explicit form of the functions $\Phi_{f_1}^{(1)}$ and $\Phi_{f_1}^{(2)}$ we can now estimate $\mid \Phi_{f_1}^{(1)} \cdot \Phi_{f_1}^{(2)} - \sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1) \mid$. To estimate $\Phi_{f_1}^{(1)}$, suppose that $0 \le y_{f_1}^{(s)} \le \vartheta_0^{(1)} < 1$, where we shall choose the constant $\vartheta_0^{(1)}$ later. It is easy to see that

$$|\Phi_{f_1}^{(1)} - \sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1)| = \sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1)|\prod_{s=1}^{p_1}(1+\frac{(1-\sigma_{f_1}^{(i_s)})}{\sigma_{f_1}^{(i_s)}}y_{f_1}^{(s)}) - 1| \le C_4\vartheta_0^{(1)},$$

where the constant $C_4 > 0$ depends only on the $\sigma_{f_1}^{(i_s)}, 1 \le s \le p_1$.

We set $\vartheta_0^{(1)} = \min\{\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{16C_4}, 1\}$. Then

$$\mid \Phi_{f_1}^{(1)} - \sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1) \mid < \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{16}, \tag{5.5}$$

for all $0 \le y_{f_1}^{(s)} \le \vartheta_0^{(1)}$, $1 \le s \le p_1$.

We next estimate $|\Phi_{f_1}^{(2)} - 1|$ for large values of $x_{f_1}^{(s)}, 1 \le s \le p_1$. Using the explicit form of the function $\Phi_{f_1}^{(2)}$, we see that the inequality

$$|\Phi_{f_1}^{(2)} - 1| < R_2 \sum_{s=1}^{p_1} \frac{1}{x_{f_1}^{(s)}}, \tag{5.6}$$

holds for all $y_{f_1}^{(s)}$, $0 \le y_{f_1}^{(s)} \le 1$, and $x_{f_1}^{(s)} > 0, 1 \le s \le p_1$, where the constant $R_2 > 0$ depends only on $\sigma_{f_1}^{(i_s)}, 1 \le s \le p_1$.

Suppose now, that $x_{f_1}^{(s)} \ge \Omega_0^{(1)}, 1 \le s \le p_1$. By (5.6) we have $|\Phi_{f_1}^{(2)} - 1| < R_3 p_1 \frac{1}{\Omega_0^{(1)}}$. It follows from this together with (5.5) that $|\Phi_{f_1}^{(1)} \cdot \Phi_{f_1}^{(2)} - \sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1)| \le |\Phi_{f_1}^{(1)} - \sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1)| + |\Phi_{f_1}^{(1)}| \cdot |\Phi_{f_1}^{(2)} - 1| \le \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{16} + (\sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1) + \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{16}) R_3 p_1 \frac{1}{\Omega_0^{(1)}}$. We choose $\Omega_0^{(1)}$ in such a way that the relation $\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{16} + (\sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1) + \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{16}) R_3 p_1 \frac{1}{\Omega_0^{(1)}} = \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{8}$ holds, whence, $\Omega_0^{(1)} = \frac{16\sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1) + \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}} R_3 p_1$. As a result we have $|\Phi_{f_1}^{(1)} \cdot \Phi_{f_1}^{(2)} - \sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1)| \le \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{8}$ for $0 \le y_{f_1}^{(s)} \le \vartheta_0^{(1)}$ and $x_{f_1}^{(s)} \ge \Omega_0^{(1)}, 1 \le s \le p_1$. It follows from this that the assertion (5.2) of the lemma holds. Analogously it can be shown that with

$$\vartheta_0^{(2)} := \min\{\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{16C_5}, 1\},\ \Omega_0^{(2)} := \frac{16\sigma_{f_2}(\widehat{B}_2) + \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}} R_4 p_2, \tag{5.7}$$

and $0 \le y_{f_2}^{(t)} \le \vartheta_0^{(2)}$ and $x_{f_2}^{(t)} \ge \Omega_0^{(2)}, 1 \le t \le p_2$, the assertion (5.3) of Lemma 5.2 holds. In (5.7) the constants $C_5 > 0$ and $R_4 > 0$ depend on the $\sigma_{f_2}^{(j_t)}, 1 \le t \le p_2$. If we finally set $\vartheta_0 := \min\{\vartheta_0^{(1)}, \vartheta_0^{(2)}\}$ and $\Omega_0 := \max\{\Omega_0^{(1)}, \Omega_0^{(2)}\}$ Lemma 5.2 holds for $x_{f_1}^{(s)}$, $x_{f_2}^{(t)} \ge \Omega_0$ and $y_{f_1}^{(s)}$, $y_{f_2}^{(t)} \in [0, \vartheta_0)$, $1 \le s \le p_1$, $1 \le t \le p_2$.

Define

$$\overline{\Omega}_0 := \max \Omega_0(\sigma_{f_1}^{(i_1)}, ..., \sigma_{f_1}^{(i_{p_1})}, \sigma_{f_2}^{(j_1)}, ..., \sigma_{f_2}^{(j_{p_2})}) \tag{5.8}$$

$$\overline{\vartheta}_0 := \min \vartheta_0(\sigma_{f_1}^{(i_1)}, ..., \sigma_{f_1}^{(i_{p_1})}, \sigma_{f_1}^{(j_1)}, ..., \sigma_{f_2}^{(j_{p_2})}) \tag{5.9}$$

where the minimum and maximum are taken over all "not coinciding" subsets $\widehat{B}_1$ and $\widehat{B}_2$ of the break points of f_1 and f_2 and $v_1, v_2 > 0$ are the total variations of $\ln Df_1$ and $\ln Df_2$ over S^1 respectively. Next we define the following constants M_0 and ζ_0:

$$M_0 := \overline{\Omega}_0 e^{\max\{v_1, v_2\}}, \ \zeta_0 := \overline{\vartheta}_0 e^{-\min\{v_1, v_2\}}.$$

Let $K_0 = K_0(f_1, f_2, M_0, \zeta_0) > M_0 > 1$ be the constant K as defined in Theorem 4.4.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose the circle homeomorphisms f_1 and f_2 satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.5 and $Dh(x_0) = \omega_0 > 0$ at some point $x_0 \in S^1$. Let be $\delta > 0$ and assume the triples intervals $([z_s, z_{s+1}],\ s = 1, 2, 3)$ and $([h(z_s), h(z_{s+1})],\ s = 1, 2, 3)$ cover the "not coinciding" subsets $\widehat{B}_1$ and $\widehat{B}_2$ of break points of f_1 and f_2 "$(K_0, M_0, \delta, \zeta_0; x_0, h(x_0))$-regularly" for some $r_n \in \{q_{n-1}, q_n, q_n + q_{n-1}\}$. Then for sufficiently large n the following inequality holds:*

$$|\ \frac{Dist(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4; f_1^{r_n})}{Dist(h(z_1), h(z_2), h(z_3), h(z_4); f_2^{r_n})} - 1\ | \ge R_5 > 0, \tag{5.10}$$

where the constant R_5 depends only on f_1 and f_2.

Proof of Lemma 5.3. Suppose, the triples of intervals $([z_s, z_{s+1}],\ s = 1, 2, 3)$ and $([h(z_s), h(z_{s+1})],\ s = 1, 2, 3)$ cover the "not coinciding" subsets $\widehat{B}_1$ and $\widehat{B}_2$ of break points of f_1 and f_2 "$(K_0, M_0, \delta, \zeta_0; x_0, h(x_0))$-regularly" for some $r_n \in \{q_{n-1}, q_n, q_{n-1} + q_{n-1}\}$. To be definite, assume $\widehat{B}_1 = \{b_1^{(i_1)}, b_1^{(i_2)}, ..., b_1^{(i_{p_1})}\} \ne \emptyset$, $\widehat{B}_2 = \{b_2^{(j_1)}, b_2^{(j_2)}, ..., b_2^{(j_{p_2})}\} \ne \emptyset$. By Definition 4.3, the triples of intervals $([z_s, z_{s+1}],\ s = 1, 2, 3)$ and $([h(z_s), h(z_{s+1})],\ s = 1, 2, 3)$ cover the subsets $\widehat{B}_1$ respectively $\widehat{B}_2$ "$(K_0, M_0, \delta, \zeta_0; x_0)$-regularly" respectively "$(K_0, M_0, \delta, \zeta_0; h(x_0))$-regularly".

By Definition 4.1 we have $\overline{b}_1^{(i_s)} \in [z_1, z_2],\ 1 \le s \le p_1$ and $\overline{b}_2^{(j_t)} \in [h(z_1), h(z_2)],\ 1 \le t \le p_2$. Notice that the intervals $f_1^{l_1^{(i_s)}}([z_1, z_2])$, $1 \le s \le p_1$ cover the break points $b_1^{(i_s)}$, $1 \le s \le p_1$. Similarly, the intervals $f_2^{l_2^{(j_t)}}([h(z_1), h(z_2)])$, $1 \le t \le p_2$ cover the break points $b_2^{(j_t)}$, $1 \le t \le p_2$. Next we want to compare the distortion $Dist(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4; f_1^{r_n})$ and $Dist(h(z_1), h(z_2), h(z_3), h(z_4); f_2^{r_n})$. We estimate only the first distortion, the second one can be estimated analogously. Obviously

$$Dist(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4; f_1^{r_n}) = \frac{Cr(f_1^{r_n}(z_1), f_1^{r_n}(z_2), f_1^{r_n}(z_3), f_1^{r_n}(z_4))}{Cr(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4)} =$$

$$= \frac{Cr(f_1(z_1), f_1(z_2), f_1(z_3), f_1(z_4))}{Cr(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4)} \times \frac{Cr(f_1^2(z_1), f_1^2(z_2), f_1^2(z_3), f_1^2(z_4))}{Cr(f(z_1), f(z_2), f(z_3), f(z_4))} \times ...$$

$$\times\frac{Cr(f_1^{r_n}(z_1),f_1^{r_n}(z_2),f_1^{r_n}(z_3),f_1^{r_n}(z_4))}{Cr(f_1^{r_n-1}(z_1),f_1^{r_n-1}(z_2),f_1^{r_n-1}(z_3),f_1^{r_n-1}(z_4))}=\prod_{i=0}^{r_n-1}Dist(f_1^i(z_1),f_1^i(z_2),f_1^i(z_3),f_1^i(z_4);f_1).$$

We rewrite $Dist(z_1,z_2,z_3,z_4;f_1^{r_n})$ in the form

$$Dist(z_1,z_2,z_3,z_4;f_1^{r_n})=\prod_{s=1}^{p_1}Dist(f_1^{l_1^{(i_s)}}(z_1),f_1^{l_1^{(i_s)}}(z_2),f_1^{l_1^{(i_s)}}(z_3),f_1^{l_1^{(i_s)}}(z_4);f_1)\times$$

$$\times\prod_{i=0,i\neq l_1^{(i_s)},s=\overline{1,p_1}}^{r_n-1}Dist(f_1^i(z_1),f_1^i(z_2),f_1^i(z_3),f_1^i(z_4);f_1). \tag{5.11}$$

To estimate the first factor in (5.11) we use Lemma 2.11 and the definition of the functions $G_{f_1}^{(i)}(x,y)$ to get

$$Dist(f_1^{l_1^{(i_s)}}(z_1),f_1^{l_1^{(i_s)}}(z_2),f_1^{l_1^{(i_s)}}(z_3),f_1^{l_1^{(i_s)}}(z_4);f_1)=$$

$$=\frac{[\sigma_{f_1}^{(i_s)}+(1-\sigma_{f_1}^{(i_s)})z_{f_1}^{(i_s)}(l_1^{(i_s)})](1+\xi_{f_1}(l_1^{(i_s)}))}{\sigma_{f_1}^{(i_s)}+(1-\sigma_{f_1}^{(i_s)})z_{f_1}^{(i_s)}(l_1^{(i_s)})+\xi_{f_1}(l_1^{(i_s)})}+\chi_s^{(1)}=$$

$$=G_{f_1}^{(i_s)}(\xi_{f_1}(l_1^{(i_s)}),z_{f_1}^{(i_s)}(l_1^{(i_s)}))+\chi_s^{(1)},\quad 1\leq s\leq p_1, \tag{5.12}$$

where $|\chi_s^{(1)}|\leq C_2\ell([f_1^{l_1^{(i_s)}}(z_1),f_1^{l_1^{(i_s)}}(z_4)])$, $1\leq s\leq p_1$. By construction the interval $[z_1,z_4]$ (see (4.3),(4.8),(4.11)) is r_n-small and therefore the intervals $f_1^i([z_1,z_4])$, $0<i<r_n$ are pairwise disjoint. Hence, using Corollary 2.5 we obtain

$$\ell(f_1^i([z_1,z_4]))\leq const\lambda_1^n,\ i=\overline{0,r_n-1}, \tag{5.13}$$

where $\lambda_1=(1+e^{-v_1})^{-\frac{1}{2}}<1$.

Fix now some $\varepsilon>0$. There exists $N=N(\varepsilon)>1$ such that

$$|\chi_s^{(1)}|<C_6\varepsilon,\ 1\leq s\leq p_1 \tag{5.14}$$

holds for $n>N$, where the constant $C_6>0$ depends only on f_1.

Suppose, $\xi_{f_1}(0)$ and $z_{f_1}^{(i_s)}(0)$, $1\leq s\leq p_1$ satisfy the following conditions: $\xi_{f_1}(0)>M_0$ and $z_{f_1}^{(i_s)}(0)<\zeta_0$ for $1\leq s\leq p_1$. Then, using relations (4.1) we get $\xi_{f_1}(l_1^{(i_s)})>\overline{\Omega}_0$ and $z_{f_1}^{(i_s)}(l_1^{(i_s)})<\overline{\vartheta}_0$, $1\leq s\leq p_1$, where $\overline{\Omega}_0$ and $\overline{\vartheta}_0$ defined in (5.8) and (5.9). Since $\overline{\vartheta}_0$ is the minimum of ϑ_0, the assertion of Lemma 5.2 is true for $\overline{\vartheta}_0$ also. It follows from the assertion of Lemma 5.2 that

$$|\prod_{s=1}^{p_1}G_{f_1}^{(i_s)}(\xi_{f_1}(l_1^{(i_s)}),z_{f_1}^{(i_s)}(l_1^{(i_s)}))-\sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1)|\leq\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{8}. \tag{5.15}$$

By combining (5.12)-(5.15) we obtain

$$|\prod_{s=1}^{p_1}[G_{f_1}^{(i_s)}(\xi_{f_1}(l_1^{(i_s)}),z_{f_1}^{(i_s)}(l_1^{(i_s)}))+\chi_s^{(1)}]-\sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1)|\leq\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{6} \tag{5.16}$$

for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$.

Next we estimate the second factor in (5.11). Applying Lemma 2.10 we obtain

$$\prod_{i=0, i\neq l_1^{(i_s)}, s=\overline{1,p_1}}^{r_n-1} Dist(f_1^i(z_1), f_1^i(z_2), f_1^i(z_3), f_1^i(z_4); f_1) =$$

$$= \exp\{ \sum_{i=0, i\neq l_1^{(i_s)}, s=\overline{1,p_1}}^{r_n-1} \log(1 + O((\ell([f_1^i(z_1), f_1^i(z_4)]))^{1+\alpha}))\} \tag{5.17}$$

Using the bound (5.13) and that the interval $[z_1, z_4]$ is r_n-small, we obtain from (5.17)

$$| \prod_{i=0, i\neq l_1^{(i_s)}, s=\overline{1,p_1}}^{r_n-1} Dist(f_1^i(z_1), f_1^i(z_2), f_1^i(z_3), f_1^i(z_4); f_1) - 1| \leq$$

$$\leq const \lambda_1^{n\alpha} \sum_{i=0, i\neq l_1^{(i_s)}, s=\overline{1,p_1}}^{r_n-1} (\ell([f_1^i(z_1), f_1^i(z_4)]) \leq const \lambda_1^{n\alpha}. \tag{5.18}$$

The relations (5.16) and (5.18) imply that for sufficiently large n

$$|Dist(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4; f_1^{r_n}) - \sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1)| < \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{4} \tag{5.19}$$

holds.

The same way it can be shown that for the triple of intervals $([h(z_s), h(z_{s+1})],\ s = 1, 2, 3)$ covering the set $\widehat{B}_2$ "$(K_0, M_0, \delta, \zeta_0; h(x_0))$-regularly" the following inequality

$$|Dist(h(z_1), h(z_2), h(z_3), h(z_4); f_2^{r_n}) - \sigma_{f_2}(\widehat{B}_2)| < \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{4} \tag{5.20}$$

holds for sufficiently large n . The inequalities (5.19) and (5.20) show that

$$\frac{Dist(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4; f_1^{r_n})}{Dist(h(z_1), h(z_2), h(z_3), h(z_4); f_2^{r_n})} - 1 \geq \frac{4(\sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1) - \sigma_{f_2}(\widehat{B}_2)) - 2\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{4\sigma_{f_2}(\widehat{B}_2) + \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}} > 0, \tag{5.21}$$

if $\sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1) > \sigma_{f_2}(\widehat{B}_2)$, and

$$\frac{Dist(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4; f_1^{r_n})}{Dist(h(z_1), h(z_2), h(z_3), h(z_4); f_2^{r_n})} - 1 \leq \frac{4(\sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1) - \sigma_{f_2}(\widehat{B}_2)) + 2\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}{4\sigma_{f_2}(\widehat{B}_2) - \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}} < 0, \tag{5.22}$$

if $\sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1) < \sigma_{f_2}(\widehat{B}_2)$. If we set

$$R_5 := \min\{\frac{|4(\sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1) - \sigma_{f_2}(\widehat{B}_2)) - 2\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}|}{4\sigma_{f_2}(\widehat{B}_2) + \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}, \frac{|4(\sigma_{f_1}(\widehat{B}_1) - \sigma_{f_2}(\widehat{B}_2)) + 2\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}|}{4\sigma_{f_2}(\widehat{B}_2) - \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,2}}\}, \tag{5.23}$$

where the minimum is taken over all "not coinciding" subsets $\widehat{B}_1$ and $\widehat{B}_2$ of break points f_1 and f_2, then It follows from (5.21)-(5.23) that the assertion of the lemma holds.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let f_1 and f_2 be circle homeomorphisms satisfying the conditions of Theorem 1.5. The lift $H(x)$ of the conjugating map $h(x)$ is a continuous and monotone increasing function on R^1. Hence $H(x)$ has a finite derivative $DH(x)$ for almost all x with respect to Lebesgue measure. We claim that $Dh(x) = 0$ at all the points x where the finite derivative exists. Suppose $Dh(x_0) > 0$ for some point $x_0 \in S^1$. We fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $K_0 = K_0(f_1, f_2, M_0, \zeta_0) > M_0 > 1$ be the constant defined in the assertion of Theorem 4.4. By the assertion of Theorem 4.4, for sufficiently large n there exist "not coinciding" subsets $\widehat{B}_1$ and $\widehat{B}_2$ of break points of f_1 and f_2, points $z_i \in S^1$, $1 \le i \le 4$, with $z_1 \prec z_2 \prec z_3 \prec z_4$ and a number $r_n \in \{q_{n-1}, q_n, q_n + q_{n-1}\}$ such that the triples of intervals $[z_s, z_{s+1}]$, $s = 1, 2, 3$, and $[h(z_s), h(z_{s+1})]$, $s = 1, 2, 3$, cover the points of $\widehat{B}_1$ and $\widehat{B}_2$ "$(K_0, M_0, \delta, \zeta_0; x_0, h(x_0))$-regularly" for r_n. By Definition 4.1 of a regularly covering each of the systems of intervals $([z_s, z_{s+1}],\ s = 1, 2, 3)$ and $([f_1^{r_n}(z_s), f_1^{r_n}(z_{s+1})],\ s = 1, 2, 3)$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 5.1 with constant $R_1 = K_0$.

Using the assertion of Lemma 5.1 we obtain

$$|Dist(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4; h) - 1| \le C_3\varepsilon, \tag{5.24}$$

$$|Dist(f_1^{r_n}(z_1), f_1^{r_n}(z_2), f_1^{r_n}(z_3), f_1^{r_n}(z_4); h) - 1| \le C_3\varepsilon. \tag{5.25}$$

Hence

$$\left|\frac{Dist(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4; h)}{Dist(f_1^{r_n}(z_1), f_1^{r_n}(z_2), f_1^{r_n}(z_3), f_1^{r_n}(z_4); h)} - 1\right| \le C_7\varepsilon, \tag{5.26}$$

where the constant $C_7 > 0$ does not depend on ε and n.

Since h is conjugating f_1 and f_2 we can readily see that

$$Cr(h(f_1^{r_n}(z_1)), h(f_1^{r_n}(z_2)), h(f_1^{r_n}(z_3)), h(f_1^{r_n}(z_4))) =$$

$$= Cr(f_2^{r_n}(h(z_1)), f_2^{r_n}(h(z_2)), f_2^{r_n}(h(z_3)), f_2^{r_n}(h(z_4))).$$

Hence we obtain

$$\frac{Dist(f_1^{r_n}(z_1), f_1^{r_n}(z_2), f_1^{r_n}(z_3), f_1^{r_n}(z_4); h)}{Dist(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4; h)} =$$

$$= \frac{Cr(h(f_1^{r_n}(z_1)), h(f_1^{r_n}(z_2)), h(f_1^{r_n}(z_3)), h(f_1^{r_n}(z_4)))}{Cr(f_1^{r_n}(z_1), f_1^{r_n}(z_2), f_1^{r_n}(z_3), f_1^{r_n}(z_4))} \times$$

$$\times \frac{Cr(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4)}{Cr(h(z_1), h(z_2), h(z_3), h(z_4))} = \frac{Cr(f_2^{r_n}(h(z_1)), f_2^{r_n}(h(z_2)), f_2^{r_n}(h(z_3)), f_2^{r_n}(h(z_4)))}{Cr(h(z_1), h(z_2), h(z_3), h(z_4))} :$$

$$: \frac{Cr(f_1^{r_n}(z_1), f_1^{r_n}(z_2), f_1^{r_n}(z_3), f_1^{r_n}(z_4))}{Cr(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4)} = \frac{Dist(h(z_1), h(z_2), h(z_3), h(z_4); f_2^{r_n})}{Dist(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4; f_1^{r_n})}.$$

This, together with (5.26) obviously implies that

$$\left| \frac{Dist(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4; f_1^{r_n})}{Dist(h(z_1), h(z_2), h(z_3), h(z_4); f_2^{r_n})} - 1 \right| \le C_8\varepsilon.$$

where the constant $C_8 > 0$ does not depend on ε and n. But this contradicts equation (5.10). Theorem 1.5 is therefore completely proved.

References

[1] V.I. Arnol'd: *Small denominators: I. Mappings from the circle onto itself.* Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Ser. Mat., **25**, 21-86 (1961).

[2] H. Akhadkulov, A. Dzhalilov and D. Mayer: *On conjugations of circle homeomorphisms with two break points.* Ergod. Theor. Dyn. Syst. FirstView Article, pp 1-17 DOI: 10.1017/etds.2012.

[3] I.P. Cornfeld, S.V. Fomin and Ya.G. Sinai: *Ergodic Theory*, Springer Verlag, Berlin (1982).

[4] K. Cunha and D. Smania: *Rigidity for piecewise smooth homeomorphisms on the circle.* arXiv: 1201.1401 v 1 [math.DS] 6 Jan 2012.

[5] A. Denjoy: *Sur les courbes définies par les équations différentielles à la surface du tore.* J. Math. Pures Appl., **11**, 333-375 (1932).

[6] A.A. Dzhalilov and K.M. Khanin: *On invariant measure for homeomorphisms of a circle with a point of break.*, Funct. Anal. Appl., **32**, (3) 153-161 (1998).

[7] A.A. Dzhalilov and I. Liousse: *Circle homeomorphisms with two break points.* Nonlinearity, **19**, 1951-1968 (2006).

[8] A.A. Dzhalilov, I. Liousse and D. Mayer: *Singular measures of piecewise smooth circle homeomorphisms with two break points.* Discrete and continuous dynamical systems, **24**, (2), 381-403 (2009).

[9] A.A. Dzhalilov, D. Mayer and U.A. Safarov: *Piecwise-smooth circle homeomorphisms with several break points.* Izvestiya RAN: Ser. Mat. 76:1 95-113, transl. of Izvestiya: Mathematics 76:1 95-113, (2012).

[10] A.A. Dzhalilov, H. Akin, S. Temir: *Conjugations between circle maps with a single break point.* Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, **366**, 1-10 (2010).

[11] M. Herman: *Sur la conjugaison différentiable des difféomorphismes du cercle à des rotations.* Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci. Publ. Math., **49**, 225-234 (1979).

[12] Y. Katznelson and D. Ornstein: *The absolute continuity of the conjugation of certain diffeomorphisms of the circle.* Ergod. Theor. Dyn. Syst., **9**, 681-690 (1989).

[13] K.M. Khanin and D. Khmelev: *Renormalizations and Rigidity Theory for Circle Homeomorphisms with Singularities of the Break Type.* Commun. Math. Phys., **235**, 69-124 (2003).

[14] K.M. Khanin and Ya.G. Sinai: *Smoothness of conjugacies of diffeomorphisms of the circle with rotations.* Russ. Math. Surv., **44**, 69-99 (1989), translation of Usp. Mat. Nauk, **44**, 57-82 (1989).

[15] K.M. Khanin and A.Yu. Teplinsky: *Renormalization Horseshoe and Rigidity for Circle Diffeomorphisms with Breaks.*Commun. Math. Phys. **320**, 347377 (2013).

[16] I. Liousse: *PL Homeomorphisms of the circle which are piecewise C^1 conjugate to irrational rotations.* Bull Braz. Math Soc, New Series **35**, (2) 269-280 (2004).

[17] J. Moser: *A rapid convergent iteration method and non-linear differential equations.* II. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa, **20**(3), 499-535 (1966).

[18] J.C. Yoccoz: *Il n'y a pas de contre-exemple de Denjoy analytique.* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris T. 298; **7**, 141-144 (1984).